

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 19, 2007, is acknowledged.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0044903 to Ling *et al.* Applicant has amended claim 1 to provide additional features of the housing and believes, which Ling *et al.* does not disclose. Claim 1 now requires extensions extending into the housing and the opening configured to receive the hasp is located between the extensions, as is clearly shown in Figure 2A of the application. In addition, claim 1 provides that the locking pin is located in the housing and below the lower extension. Ling *et al.* does not include this feature and the opening in Ling *et al.* as noted by the Examiner is located at 50 for receiving the object. Additionally, even if the parts surrounding object 50 in Ling *et al.* were to be considered extensions, the locking pin is located above these extensions and not below as required by claim 1. Applicant's invention provides an advantage over that disclosed by Ling *et al.* as the hasp is secured between the extensions by the locking member. On the other hand, the hardware 50 in Ling *et al.* a secured bi-cantilevered second shackle 30 and not the locking member.

Claim 1 also requires that the locking member is insertable through the hole in at least a portion of the housing in the hasp or door hardware into a locked position. Locking member 20 of Ling *et al.* does not extend through the hasp or door hardware in the locked position. Rather, second shackle 30 is pushed by the first shackle to lock object 50. As noted above, this design in Ling *et al.* cannot be considered to encompass the limitations of amended claim 1.

As claim 1 is not anticipated by Ling *et al.*, dependent claims 2-12 should also be allowable. Additionally, applicant has added further features to claim 2 not taught or disclosed by Ling *et al.*, wherein it is clarified that the locking member is insertable throughout the hasp. As noted above, the locking member in Ling *et al.* is not inserted into the house, but rather the first locking member engages a second shackle that is insertable into the object. In addition, claim 2 also includes the features that the extensions have holes and that the locking member is insertable through the holes in the extensions in the hole in the housing. Again, this feature is not taught or disclosed by Ling *et al.*

Claim 13 was also rejected as being anticipated by Ling *et al.* Claim 13 has been revised to include additional features in the invention that the locking pins operated by electro-mechanical device and that an armature on the electro-mechanical device moves in a direction opposite the locking pin and wherein the armature extension and locking pin are joined by a connecting lever member mounted on a pivot. Ling *et al.* does not include an electro-mechanical device and the locking electro-mechanical member in U.S. Patent No. 6,761,051 to Tsai does not include the features set forth in amended claim 13.

As claim 13 is not anticipated by Ling *et al.*, remaining dependent claims 14 and 16-21 should also be allowable.

Claim 22 was rejected as being anticipated by Tsai. Applicant has amended claim 22 to include features not taught or disclosed by Tsai. Amended claim 22 requires a locked body in the end of the locking member and movable parts on the biasing apparatus are contained completely within the locked body in the locked position. As such, independent claim 22 is not anticipated by Tsai.

As claim 22 is not anticipated by Tsai, dependent claims 23-28 should also be allowable.


Claim 29 was rejected as being anticipated by Ling *et al.* Claim 29 has been amended to include additional features of the invention including circumferential grooves on the locking pin, sealing members in the grooves and a lock body having a bore in which the locking pin is sealed. The locking pin in Ling *et al.* does not include these features, and as such, amended claim 29 is not anticipated thereby.

As claim 29 is not anticipated by Ling *et al.*, dependent claims 30-38 and 40-43 should also be allowable.

The applicant has made an earnest attempt to respond completely to the Office Action of April 29, 2007, and applicant believes that all remaining claims 1-14, 16-38, and 40-43 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims. Furthermore, applicant has amended and canceled certain claims solely to advance prosecution of this application and to obtain allowance on the allowable claims at the earliest possible date. Therefore, no admission may be inferred by the cancellation amendments to the claims herein.

If additional time is required, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any shortages in fees, or apply any overpayment credits, to Baker & Daniels LLP's Deposit Account No. 02-0387 (971355.3). However, please do not include the payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Tychonievich, Reg. No. 41,358
BAKER & DANIELS LLP
205 West Jefferson Boulevard, Suite 250
South Bend, IN 46601
Telephone: (574) 234-4149
Fax: (574) 239-1900

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

August 20, 2007

Date



Daniel Tychonievich, Reg. No. 41,358